

REMARKS

This Reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on August 11, 2009 in which claim 45 was allowed; in which claims 2, 3, 5, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 20, 21, 27-29, 32, 37-40, 43, 44, 52 and 53 were objected to and in which claims 1, 4, 6-9, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 22-26, 30, 31, 33-36, 41, 42 and 46-51 were rejected. With this response, claims 35 and 36 are canceled with the limitations of claim 36 being incorporated into base claim 34. Claim 32 is amended to correctly depend from claim 22. Claims 54-57 are added. Claims 1-34, 37-51 and 54-57 are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Examiner Interview Summary

On November 10, 2009, a telephonic interview was held between Examiner Peeso and Applicants' attorney, Todd A. Rathe. The rejection of claims 1, 22 and 46 was discussed. Applicants noted that each of such claims recites that the authorization granting interface or the authorization data identifies her as based upon authorized users of the resource, whereas Hanaoka appears to merely disclose a storage element identifying a "delivery channel" of the cartridge. (See Hanaoka, Paragraphs 18-21) Examiner Peeso agreed to review the previous rejection and to call the undersigned upon further review of this response in the prior art should a notice of allowance not be forthcoming.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Peeso for the opportunity to discuss the rejection.

II. Rejection of claims 1, 4, 15, 16, 22-26, 30, 31, 33-36, 41, 42 and 46-51 under 35 USC 102(e) based upon Hanaoka

Page 2 of the Office Action rejected claims 1, 4, 15, 16, 22-26, 30, 31, 33-36, 41, 42 and 46-51 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Hanaoka US Patent Publication 2006/0045595. Claims 52 and 53 are canceled with their limitations incorporated into base claims 1 and 22, respectively. Claims 35 and 36 are canceled. Claims 1, 4, 15, 16, 22-26, 30, 31, 33-34, 41, 42 and 46-51, as amended, overcome the rejection.

A. Claims 1, 22 and 46

Claims 1 and 22 each recites an authorization granting interface coupled to a resource and "configured based upon authorized users of the resource." Claim 46 recites a method which includes "coupling authorization data identifying authorized users of the resource to the resource." (Emphasis added)

Hanaoka fails to disclose an authorization granting interface coupled to a resource and "configured based upon authorized users of the resource" or a method which includes the step of "coupling authorization data identifying authorized users of the resource to the resource." In contrast, Hanaoka appears to merely disclose methods for managing rental printers. Hanaoka discloses a rental printer (not the print cartridge) which requires authorization for use of the rental printer. To prevent the renter from using inks that are not approved for use in the rental printer, Hanaoka further discloses a cartridge having a storage element that identifies "a delivery channel of the cartridge." (See Paragraph [0018]). As described in Paragraphs [020] and [0021], the delivery channel information identifies HOW the cartridge was delivered to or obtained by the renter, i.e., direct sales, store sales etc. the "delivery channel" information on the cartridge does not identify and is not based upon AUTHORIZED USERS of the resource. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 22 and 46 be withdrawn. Claims 4, 15, 16, 23-26, 30, 31, 33-33, and 47-51, depend from claims 1, 22 and 46 and overcome the rejection for at least the same reasons.

B. Claims 16 and 31

Claims 16 and 31 depend from claims 1 and 22, respectively, and recite that the authorization granting interface grants varying levels of authorization **to use** the resource based upon authorized users of the resource.

Hanaoka fails to disclose an authorization granting interface grants varying levels of authorization to use the resource based upon authorized users of the resource. As noted above,

the "delivery channel" information stored on the cartridge is not based upon authorized users of the cartridge of Hanaoka. Moreover, the "delivery channel" information does not grant varying levels of authorization to use the resource. In contrast, in Hanaoka it appears that you are simply permitted to use a cartridge based upon whether the cartridge was sold through direct sales, store sales or the like. Hanaoka does not disclose multiple levels at which a person may use the resource. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 16 and 31 be withdrawn.

C. Claim 34

Claim 34 is amended to incorporate the limitations of former claim 36. Claim 34, as amended, recites that the controller is configured to permit use of a predetermined portion of the resource by the device based upon identified authorization data associated with the cartridge.

Hanaoka fails to disclose an image-forming device having a controller that is configured to permit use of a predetermined portion of the resource by the device based upon identified authorization data associated with the cartridge. The Office Action is failed to articulate where Hanaoka allegedly discloses that the "delivery channel" information stored on the cartridge of Hanaoka permits use of a predetermined portion of the resource by the device. Accordingly, claim 34, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Hanaoka. Claim 41, 42 and 44 depend from claim 34 and overcome the rejection for at least the same reasons.

III. Rejection of claims 6-9, 12, 18 and 19 under 35 USC 103(a) based upon Hanaoka and "official notice."

Page 3 of the Office Action rejected claims 6-9, 12, 18 and 19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanaoka in view of "official notice." Claims 6-9, 12, 18 and 19 depend from claim 1 and overcome the rejection for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

IV. Added Claims

With this response, claims 54-57 are added. Claim 54-57 are believed to be patentably distinct over the prior art of record.

A. Claims 54 and 55

Claim 54 and 55 depend from claims 1 and 22, respectively, and further recite that the authorization granting interface identifies a person who is authorized to use the resource. Support for added claims 54 and 55 maybe found in at least Paragraph [0017]. Thus, no new matter is believed to be added.

The prior art of record fails to disclose an authorization granting interface that identifies a person who is authorized to use the resource. Thus, claim 54 and five are presented for consideration and allowance.

B. Claims 56 and 57

Claims 56 and 57 depend from claims 1 and 22, respectively, and further recite that the authorization granting interface is configured to grant a first authorization level in which use of the resource by a first user is denied, a second authorization level in which a second user is granted a first extent of rights to use the resource and a third authorization level in which a third user is granted a second extent of rights, different than the first extent of rights, to use the resource. Support for at a claim 56 maybe found and least Paragraph [0017]. Thus, no new matter is believed to be added.

The prior art of record fails to disclose and authorization granting interface that is configured to grant a first authorization level in which use of the resource by a first user is denied, a second authorization level in which a second user is granted a first extent of rights to use the resource and a third authorization level in which a third user is granted a second extent of rights, different than the first extent of rights, to use the resource. Accordingly, claims 56 and 57 are presented for consideration and allowance.

V. Conclusion

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-34, 37-51 and 54-57 are now pending in this application.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 11, 2009

By /Todd A. Rathe/

RATHE PATENT & IP LAW
Customer No. 22879
Telephone: (262) 478-9353
Facsimile: (262) 238-1469

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276